

**AMENDMENTS TO THE DRAWINGS:**

Figures 1-4 have been descriptively labeled as requested by the Examiner.

Attachment: Replacement Sheet 1 (Fig. 1)  
Annotated Sheet 1  
Replacement Sheet 2 (Fig. 2)  
Annotated Sheet 2  
Replacement Sheet 3 (Fig. 3)  
Annotated Sheet 3  
Replacement Sheet 4 (Fig. 4)  
Annotated Sheet 4

### **REMARKS**

In response to the Office Action, dated April 7, 2005, Applicant thanks the Examiner for considering the Information Disclosure Statement. Additionally, Applicant has amended the drawings as requested to include the information labels. Consequently, Applicant requests that this objection be withdrawn.

Applicant respectfully requests reconsideration of the 35 U.S.C. §§ 102 and 103 rejections set forth by the Examiner. Applicant has amended the claims to more clearly define the invention. Applicant submits that the references of record, whether considered alone or in combination, fail to either teach or suggest Applicant's presently claimed invention.

Applicants have modified the claims to specify that the electronic program guide (EPG) received by the computing device is received from the receiving system. This is advantageous because it provides one system/unit which efficiently transmits both video broadcast and EPG to different devices. This greatly reduces the complexity and cost of an entertainment system and provides one device capable of controlling the concurrent display of video broadcasts and EPG on a plurality of devices. The present invention is far superior to the present systems which require the computing device to receive EPG information independently or via a device other than the initial receiving system.

Nelson et al., U.S. Patent No. 5,710,605, is directed to a remote controller with a built in modem that not only displays EPG information but also controls TV devices. Col. 5, lines

14-32. Specifically, the modem receives a plurality of electrical signals representative of a plurality of TV programming scheduling items from an external supplier. Col. 5, lines 14-21. This scheduling information may be displayed on a liquid crystal display of the remote controller. Col. 5, lines 33-37. This is significantly different from the presently claimed invention which provides one receiving system that controls the concurrent display of the video broadcast on a video display and the EPG information on the computing device such as for example, a remote controller. Consequently, display of the video broadcast as well as the EPG to different devices is controlled by the same device in the presently claimed invention. Nelson et al. simply does not teach or suggest the presently claimed invention.

Shen et al., U.S. Patent No. 6,401,059, is directed to a personal digital assistant (PDA) which is capable of displaying program schedule information and controlling a video device such as a TV or vide recorder. Col. 1, lines 53-62. Shen et al. discloses a desktop computer with a software program and database that downloads television (TV) program schedule information from a web page via the internet. Col. 2, lines 41-48. The schedule information is then processed and transported to a PDA through a wired or wireless connection between the desktop and the PDA. Col. 2, line 52-Col. 3, line 4. Additionally, the PDA comprises software that allows it to control a viewing device such as a TV. However, this is simply different from the presently claimed invention which provides a single system that control the concurrent display of both video broadcast and EPG on a computing device such as, for example a PDA.

Appl. No. 09/875,546  
Amdt. Dated September 7, 2005  
Reply to Office Action of April 7, 2005


Elliott, U.S. Patent No. 6,473,097, is directed to an IP intranet functionality in a Mobile Switching Center for supporting wireless data and multimedia services that is introduced between a multimedia device and the internet. Col. 4, lines 48-52. Elliott is an inappropriate reference because it is directed to a field of endeavor different from the presently claimed invention. Elliott neither teaches nor suggests providing a system which controls concurrent display of video broadcast and EPG on a plurality of devices.

Consequently, Applicants respectfully request that the rejections be withdrawn. Applicants respectfully submit that all claims now stand in condition for allowance.

Respectfully submitted,

Date:

7 Sept 05



(Reg. #)

26,894

Todd S. Parkhurst  
**HOLLAND & KNIGHT LLP**  
131 S. Dearborn, 30<sup>th</sup> Floor  
Chicago, Illinois 60603  
Tel: (312) 263-3600  
**Attorney for Applicant**

Appl. No. 09/875,546  
Amdt. Dated September 7, 2005  
Reply to Office Action of April 7, 2005



**CERTIFICATE OF MAILING**

I hereby certify that this correspondence is being deposited with the United States  
Postal Service as First Class Mail on 7 Sept 05 in an envelope addressed to:

**Mail Stop Amendment  
Commissioner for Patents  
P.O. Box 1450  
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450**

*William S. Permut*  
Attorney for Applicants

# 3203269\_v1




Fig. 1




Fig. 2




FIG. 3